

Relaxation and Thermalization of Isolated Many-Body Quantum Systems

E. J. Torres-Herrera, Davida Kollmar, and Lea F. Santos

Department of Physics, Yeshiva University, New York, New York 10016, USA

(Dated: March 27, 2014)

We provide an overview of our numerical and analytical studies of isolated interacting quantum systems that are taken out of equilibrium instantaneously (quenched). We describe the relaxation process to a new equilibrium and obtain lower bounds for the relaxation time of full random matrices and realistic systems with two-body interactions. We show that the size of the time fluctuations after relaxation decays exponentially with system size for systems without too many degeneracies. We also discuss the conditions for thermalization and demonstrate that it can happen after local and global quenches in space. The analyses are developed for systems, initial states, and few-body observables accessible to experiments with optical lattices.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Mt, 05.70.Ln, 75.10.Jm, 72.25.Rb, 02.30.Ik

I. INTRODUCTION

The unitary evolution of many-body quantum systems is an active area of research with studies being carried out theoretically and also experimentally. In experiments with nuclear magnetic resonance [1–3], and especially those with optical lattices [4–10], the effects of the environment take time to become relevant, which allows for treating the systems as quasi-isolated. In this context, much attention has been given to the subject of quench dynamics, where the evolution of an isolated quantum system initiates with an instantaneous perturbation that takes a certain initial Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_I$ into a new final Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_F$.

Studies of quenched many-body quantum systems deal with fundamental problems of physics, such as advancing our understanding of nonequilibrium quantum physics and deriving thermodynamics from quantum mechanics. Among the several specific questions that have been raised, we address three that we have been particularly interested in [11–15].

(i) How fast can isolated many-body quantum systems evolve? We try to answer this question by studying the fidelity decay (Loschmidt echo) and the evolution of few-body observables.

The fidelity corresponds to the overlap between the initial state and its evolved counterpart. It is obtained by Fourier transforming the energy distribution of the initial state. The fidelity is also analogous to the characteristic function of the probability distribution of work [16–18], which is essential in studies about work statistics in quantum thermodynamics.

The minimum fidelity decay time was derived from the time-energy uncertainty relation [19–23] and can be reached in particular scenarios. In the general picture of quench dynamics, where the energy distribution of the initial state is usually single-peaked, we show that the fastest possible decay occurs for evolutions under full random matrices [13, 14]. Full random matrices provide a way to acquire statistical information about complex systems, but they also imply simultaneous interactions of many particles, which is unrealistic. In realistic systems

with two-body interactions, the fastest fidelity decay is Gaussian. This happens when the energy distribution of the initial state is also Gaussian and fills the energy shell. The latter gives the maximum possible spreading of initial states projected onto final two-body-interaction Hamiltonians. Thus, the minimum relaxation time for such realistic systems occurs when the Gaussian behavior of the fidelity holds until saturation [13, 14].

The evolution of few-body observables depends not only on the interplay between the initial state and final Hamiltonian, as the fidelity, but also on the details about the observable, which makes the problem more difficult. However, if the observable commutes with the initial Hamiltonian, its short-time dynamics is partly controlled by the fidelity behavior, which allows for a simple picture of the observable evolution.

(ii) How large are the time fluctuations of observables around the steady state after relaxation? Equilibration in isolated quantum systems can happen in a probabilistic sense. It requires that the time fluctuations be small, implying proximity to the stationary state for the vast majority of time, and that the fluctuations decrease with system size, vanishing in the thermodynamic limit. We show that the temporal fluctuations of the fidelity decay exponentially with system size. This is in agreement with our analyses for the fluctuations of observables and holds for chaotic and also integrable systems, provided the spectrum be not highly degenerate [11].

(iii) After relaxation, what are the conditions for the new reached equilibrium to be thermal? Thermalization occurs when the infinite time averages of few-body observables coincide with thermal averages. It is certain to occur when the energy distribution of the initial state fills the energy shell ergodically. Any eigenstate from a full random matrix projected on the energy eigenbasis of a final two-body-interaction Hamiltonian, chaotic or integrable, falls in this category. But this is not a very interesting case, since such initial states have infinite temperature and are already thermal before the quench [11, 12, 24]. For the realistic scenario of initial states of finite temperature, the expectation is that thermalization is viable when the final Hamiltonian is chaotic

and the energy of the initial state is away from the edges of the spectrum of $\hat{H}_F$ (the borders are problematic, because the states there are not strongly mixed for systems with few-body interactions) [12, 15, 25–44]. We provide illustrations supporting this idea.

We show that the infinite time average and the thermodynamic average approach each other as the energy of the initial state moves closer to the center of the spectrum, the perturbation gets stronger, and the system size increases. This holds for global and also local quenches in space [15].

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the models. Section III analyzes the relationship between fidelity decay and energy distribution of the initial state. Section IV gives results for the temporal fluctuations after relaxation. The viability of thermalization is discussed and illustrated in Sec. V. Concluding remarks are presented in Sec. VI.

II. MODEL AND QUENCH

Full random matrices are often employed to model the spectrum of many-body quantum systems. They are filled with random numbers and satisfy the symmetries of the system they aim at describing. Their level spacing distributions show level repulsion [29, 45–48]. However, despite the agreement with the spectra of complex systems, full random matrices are unrealistic, because they imply the simultaneous interactions of many particles. Realistic systems have few-body interactions. These systems also show level repulsion when they are in the chaotic domain, but other properties differ from full random matrices. For example, the density of states of full random-matrices has a semicircular shape and all of their eigenstates are pseudo-random vectors, whereas in realistic systems with few-body interactions the density of states is Gaussian and the eigenstates can only reach a high level of delocalization in the middle of the spectrum, being more localized at the edges [29, 49–51].

A. Spin-1/2 Model

The realistic systems that we investigate correspond to spin-1/2 models with two-body interactions and no randomness. These models describe real magnetic compounds [52–54], crystals of fluorapatite [1, 2], and have also been simulated with optical lattices [8–10]. We focus on one-dimensional lattices with open boundaries and an even number L of sites. They can be mapped onto systems of spinless fermions [55] or hardcore bosons [56].

The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} &= \varepsilon J \hat{S}_1^z + d J \hat{S}_{[L/2]}^z + \hat{H}_{NN} + \lambda \hat{H}_{NNN}, \\ \hat{H}_{NN} &= \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} J \left(\hat{S}_j^x \hat{S}_{j+1}^x + \hat{S}_j^y \hat{S}_{j+1}^y + \Delta \hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_{j+1}^z \right), \\ \hat{H}_{NNN} &= \sum_{j=1}^{L-2} J \left(\hat{S}_j^x \hat{S}_{j+2}^x + \hat{S}_j^y \hat{S}_{j+2}^y + \Delta \hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_{j+2}^z \right).\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Above, $\hbar = 1$ and $\hat{S}_i^{x,y,z} = \hat{\sigma}_i^{x,y,z}$ are spin operators acting on site i , $\hat{\sigma}_i^{x,y,z}$ being the Pauli matrices. $\hat{S}_i^x \hat{S}_{i+1}^x + \hat{S}_i^y \hat{S}_{i+1}^y$ ($\hat{S}_i^x \hat{S}_{i+2}^x + \hat{S}_i^y \hat{S}_{i+2}^y$) is the flip-flop term and $\hat{S}_i^z \hat{S}_{i+1}^z$ ($\hat{S}_i^z \hat{S}_{i+2}^z$) is the Ising interaction between NN (NNN) spins. All the parameters, $J, \Delta, \lambda, \varepsilon$ and d , are assumed positive. J is the exchange coupling constant, Δ is the anisotropy parameter (we are interested in the gapless regime, where $\Delta < 1$), and λ refers to the ratio between NNN and NN couplings. The total spin in the z -direction, $\hat{S}^z = \sum_i \hat{S}_i^z$, is conserved.

The impurities εJ on the first site of the chain and dJ on site $[L/2]$ are generated by applying two local static magnetic fields in the z -direction. The purpose of the small defect (impurity) on the first site is to break trivial symmetries, such as parity, conservation of total spin, and spin reversal, without breaking the integrability of the system [57]. If $\varepsilon = d = 0$, we refer to the system as clean.

Depending on the values of the parameters Δ, d , and λ , the chain may be integrable or chaotic:

- *Integrable XX model:* $d, \Delta, \lambda = 0$. This Hamiltonian can be mapped onto a system of noninteracting spinless fermions, being trivially solvable [55].
- *Integrable XXZ model:* $\Delta \neq 0$ and $d, \lambda = 0$. This model is solved by means of the Bethe ansatz [58].
- *Chaotic impurity model:* $\Delta, d \neq 0$ and $\lambda = 0$. The addition of a single impurity close to the middle of the chain in the presence of NN couplings can bring the system into the chaotic domain [15, 59–61] provided $d \lesssim 1$. If the defect becomes too large it splits the system in two independent and integrable chains. The onset of chaos is caused by the interplay between the Ising interaction and the impurity. In contrast, the addition of d to the XX model does not affect its integrability.
- *Chaotic NNN model:* $\Delta, \lambda \neq 0$ and $d = 0$. The addition of couplings between second neighbors breaks integrability [12, 51, 62, 63].

Note that the values of d and λ leading to chaos depends on the system size. The larger the system, the smaller the parameter needs to be [15, 38].

B. Quench Dynamics

In the scenario of quench dynamics, the initial state $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\text{ini}\rangle$ is as an eigenstate of the initial (unperturbed) Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_I$. The dynamics starts with the

sudden change of some parameter(s) of this Hamiltonian in a time interval much shorter than any characteristic time scale of the model. It brings the system to the final (perturbed) Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_F$ with eigenvalues E_α and eigenstates $|\psi_\alpha\rangle \neq |\text{ini}\rangle$. The final Hamiltonian and its eigenstates are studied in the basis corresponding to the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_I$.

The unitary time evolution of the initial state is given by

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}_F t} |\text{ini}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}} e^{-iE_{\alpha} t} |\psi_{\alpha}\rangle \quad (2)$$

where the coefficients $C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}} = \langle \psi_{\alpha} | \text{ini} \rangle$ are the overlaps of the initial state with the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_F$.

In this work, J sets the energy scale and ε is fixed. The quench takes $(\Delta_I, \lambda_I, d_I)$ into $(\Delta_F, \lambda_F, d_F)$. We only write the index I or F for parameters that get changed.

The evolution is computed numerically with full exact diagonalization for matrices of dimension $\mathcal{D} < 20\,000$ and with EXPOKIT [64, 65] for larger sizes. EXPOKIT is a software package based on Krylov subspace projection methods. Instead of diagonalizing the complete system Hamiltonian, the package computes directly the action of the matrix exponential $e^{-i\hat{H}_F t}$ on a vector of interest.

III. FIDELITY DECAY AND OBSERVABLES EVOLUTION

The fidelity gives the probability of finding the system still in the initial state after time t . It is given by the overlap,

$$\begin{aligned} F(t) &\equiv |\langle \Psi(0) | \Psi(t) \rangle|^2 \\ &= \left| \langle \text{ini} | e^{-i\hat{H}_F t} | \text{ini} \rangle \right|^2 = \left| \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 e^{-iE_{\alpha} t} \right|^2, \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the Fourier transform in energy of the components $|C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2$. The distribution $P^{\text{ini}}(E_{\alpha})$ of the components $|C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2$ in the eigenvalues E_{α} is referred to as local density of states (LDOS) or strength function [66]. Finding an expression for $F(t)$ therefore reduces to identifying the shape of the LDOS.

A. Fastest Fidelity Decay: Semicircular LDOS

For an initial state projected onto a full random matrix, the envelope of $P^{\text{ini}}(E_{\alpha})$ has a semicircular form, reflecting the density of states. The fidelity for this distribution is given by [13, 14]

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{SC}}(t) &= \left| \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} P_{\text{SC}}^{\text{ini}}(E) e^{-iEt} dE \right|^2 = \frac{[\mathcal{J}_1(2\sigma_{\text{ini}} t)]^2}{\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t^2}, \quad (4) \\ P_{\text{SC}}^{\text{ini}}(E) &= \frac{2}{\pi \varepsilon} \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{E}{\varepsilon}\right)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where 2ε is the length of the spectrum and $\sigma_{\text{ini}} = \varepsilon/2$ is the uncertainty in energy. An illustration for the semicircular LDOS and its corresponding fidelity decay is provided in Fig. 1 (a) and (b), respectively.

The fastest fidelity decay for single-peaked LDOS is therefore given by Eq. (4). It is slower than the bound, $F(t) \geq \cos^2(\sigma_{\text{ini}} t)$, derived in [19–23]. The latter can be approached when the energy distribution of $|\text{ini}\rangle$ involves at least two peaks and they are well separated in energy.

After relaxation, the fidelity,

$$F(t) = \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^4 + \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 |C_{\beta}^{\text{ini}}|^2 e^{i(E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta})t}, \quad (5)$$

saturates to its infinite time average,

$$\overline{F} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t d\tau F(\tau) = \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^4 = \frac{1}{\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}}}, \quad (6)$$

where the inverse participation ratio, IPR_{ini} , measures the level of delocalization of the initial state in the energy eigenbasis. A large IPR_{ini} indicates a delocalized state. The largest values occur for full random matrices. In the case of full random matrices from Gaussian Orthogonal Ensembles (GOE), $\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}} \sim \mathcal{D}/3$ [29, 50]. The relaxation time t_R for an initial state evolved according to GOE full random matrices can thus be calculated from

$$\frac{[\mathcal{J}_1(2\sigma_{\text{ini}} t_R)]^2}{\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t_R^2} = \frac{3}{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (7)$$

This value gives the lowest bound for the time for many-body quantum systems with single-peaked LDOS to reach saturation.

B. Exponential Fidelity Decay: Lorentzian LDOS

In systems with two-body interactions, the density of states is Gaussian instead of semicircular. The shape of the LDOS becomes dependent of the strength of the perturbation and on the energy,

$$E_{\text{ini}} = \langle \text{ini} | \hat{H}_F | \text{ini} \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 E_{\alpha}, \quad (8)$$

of the initial state. For states close to the middle of the spectrum, as the strength of an instantaneous global perturbation applied on $\hat{H}_I$ increases from zero, the LDOS broadens from a delta function to a Lorentzian form, and eventually reaches a Gaussian shape. Closer to the edges of the spectrum, the distributions are skewed [12].

A Lorentzian distribution leads to the exponential fidelity decay [67–74],

$$\begin{aligned} F_L(t) &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_{\text{BW}}^{\text{ini}}(E) e^{-iEt} dE \right|^2 = e^{-\Gamma_{\text{ini}} t}, \\ P_L^{\text{ini}}(E) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma_{\text{ini}}}{(E_{\text{ini}} - E)^2 + \Gamma_{\text{ini}}^2/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where Γ_{ini} is the width of the distribution. This scenario coincides with that of the Fermi golden rule.

C. Gaussian Fidelity Decay: Gaussian LDOS

In the limit of strong perturbation, when the LDOS is a Gaussian of width σ_{ini} , the fidelity decay becomes Gaussian [13, 14, 71, 72, 75, 76],

$$F_G(t) = \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P_G^{\text{ini}}(E) e^{-iEt} dE \right|^2 = e^{-\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t^2} \quad (9)$$

$$P_G^{\text{ini}}(E) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2}} \exp \left[-\frac{(E - E_{\text{ini}})^2}{2\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Above, the envelope $P_G^{\text{ini}}(E)$ of the LDOS corresponds to the energy shell. It gives the maximum possible spreading of $|\text{ini}\rangle$ in the eigenstates of the final Hamiltonian. Not all initial states can fill it. The ergodic filling of the energy shell is used as a definition of chaotic states.

The Gaussian fidelity decay can hold until saturation [13, 14]. The minimum relaxation time for systems with two-body interactions and a single-peaked LDOS is therefore,

$$\exp(-\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t_R^2) = \text{IPR}_{\text{ini}}^{-1} \Rightarrow t_R = \frac{\sqrt{\ln(\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}})}}{\sigma_{\text{ini}}} \quad (11)$$

The level of delocalization of the initial state together with the width of the energy shell determine the lifetime of $|\text{ini}\rangle$.

Illustrations for $P_G^{\text{ini}}(E)$ and $F_G(t)$ are given in Figs. 1 (c) and (d), respectively. We choose for $|\text{ini}\rangle$, the Néel state, $|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow \dots \downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$, whose dynamics has been studied experimentally with optical lattices [6]. We let it evolve according to a clean chaotic final Hamiltonian with $\varepsilon = 0, d = 0, \Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1$. Notice that the Gaussian decay of the fidelity persists until saturation.

Initial states such as the Néel state, where each excitation is confined to a single site, constitute the site-basis, also known as computational basis or natural basis. They are the eigenstates of the Ising interaction of the Hamiltonian (1), which determines $\hat{H}_I$, and define the basis in which $\hat{H}_F$ is written.

For site-basis vectors, it is straightforward to obtain analytically E_{ini} and the width σ_{ini} of the energy shell,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\text{ini}} &= \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 (E_{\alpha} - E_{\text{ini}})^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{n \neq \text{ini}} |\langle n | \hat{H}_F | \text{ini} \rangle|^2} \\ &= \frac{J}{2} \sqrt{M_1} + \lambda_F \frac{J}{2} \sqrt{M_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Above $|n\rangle$ are the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_I$ and the connectivity M_1 (M_2) corresponds to the number of states $|n\rangle$ directly coupled with $|\text{ini}\rangle$ via the NN (NNN) flip-flop term. Notice that for site-basis vectors, Δ and on-site energies do not affect the off-diagonal terms of $\hat{H}_F$, and therefore σ_{ini} . We can then have initial states evolving according to very different final Hamiltonians, with or without impurity, isotropic or anisotropic, which nevertheless show a very similar fidelity decay.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Local density of states (left) and fidelity decay (right). Top: Initial state from a GOE full random matrix projected onto another GOE full random matrix, $\mathcal{D} = 12870$. The random numbers are normalized so that the length of the spectrum is $4J$ and $\sigma_{\text{ini}} = J$. Middle: Néel state with $E_{\text{ini}} = -J/8$, $\sigma_{\text{ini}} = \sqrt{15}J/2$; $\varepsilon = 0, \Delta_F = 0.5, \hat{S}^z = 0, L = 16$. Bottom: Initial state from the XX model with $E_{\text{ini}} = -0.378J$, $\sigma_{\text{ini}} = 1.389J$; $\varepsilon = 0.1, \Delta_F = 0.48, \hat{S}^z = -3, L = 18$. Middle and bottom panels: $\hat{H}_F$ with $d = 0, \lambda_F = 1$. Solid lines give the analytical expressions, shaded area (left) and circles (right) are numerical results. The saturation value of the fidelity is indicated with the dashed horizontal line.

In the case of the Néel state, the picture is yet more general, because $M_2 = 0$, so σ_{ini} does not even depend on λ_F . For this state, the only distinction caused by different $\hat{H}_F$'s is on the level of saturation [13, 14]. If the parameters of the final Hamiltonian take E_{ini} closer to the edge of the spectrum, where the states are more localized and IPR_{ini} is smaller, the saturation is reached earlier. For integrable Hamiltonians, t_R is then shorter than for chaotic Hamiltonians [see values of IPR_{ini} in Table I in Sec. IV].

The Gaussian decay of the fidelity until saturation for the Néel state for integrable, chaotic, isotropic, anisotropic, clean and disordered final Hamiltonians is not an artifact of the system size. We confirmed it for L up to 24. The Gaussian behavior until saturation is observed also for various other site-basis vectors evolving under various choices of parameters Δ_F, λ_F , and d_F . The same happens also for initial states from different initial Hamiltonians, such as XX and XXZ models. In Figs. 1 (e) and (f), we show $P_G^{\text{ini}}(E)$ and $F_G(t)$, respectively, for an initial state from the XX model with E_{ini} close to the middle of the spectrum and evolving according to a chaotic Hamiltonian similar to the one considered

for the Néel state. Notice that the relaxation now occurs later than for the Néel state, at $Jt_R \sim 2$, and again the Gaussian behavior persists all the way.

However, there are cases where, despite the strong coupling regime, the fidelity decay transitions from Gaussian to exponential before saturation. In some of the cases, this is associated with the poor filling of the energy shell, which is expected. But for others, the filling is not that bad, or is at least comparable to that of the Néel state under integrable Hamiltonians. It is not very clear yet what causes this transition in our systems and how to calculate the critical time t_c where it happens. A way to estimate t_c was suggested in [71, 72, 75], but our studies have led to a broad range of values. This analysis still requires further studies.

D. Few-Body Observables

The evolution of few-body observables $\hat{O}$ depends on more factors than the fidelity decay, but a simple general picture, valid at short times, can be constructed for observables that commute with $\hat{H}_I$. In this case, the dynamics,

$$O(t) = F(t)O(0) + \sum_{n, m \neq \text{ini}} \langle \text{ini} | e^{i\hat{H}_F t} | n \rangle O_{n,m} \langle m | e^{-i\hat{H}_F t} | \text{ini} \rangle,$$

depends on the fidelity. In the equation above, $O_{n,m} = \langle n | \hat{O} | m \rangle$ and $|n\rangle$ are the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_I$. It was also used that $O_{\text{ini},n} = 0$ for $|n\rangle \neq |\text{ini}\rangle$, because $[\hat{H}_I, \hat{O}] = 0$.

In the limit of strong perturbation, where $F(t) = \exp(-\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t^2)$, the second order expansion of $O(t)$ simplifies to

$$O(t) \approx (1 - \sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t^2) O(0) + t^2 \sum_{n \neq \text{ini}} |\langle n | \hat{H}_F | \text{ini} \rangle|^2 O_{n,n}. \quad (13)$$

When $|\text{ini}\rangle$ is a site-basis vector, Eq. (13) does not depend on Δ_F or d_F , and for the Néel state not even on λ_F . The short-time dynamics of the observables can then be equivalent despite being governed by very different $\hat{H}_F$'s.

Examples of few-body observables that commute with the Ising part of the Hamiltonian (1), include the on-site magnetization, $\hat{S}_j^z$, the spin-spin correlation in the z direction between sites i and j ,

$$\hat{C}_{i,j}^z(t) = \hat{S}_i^z \hat{S}_j^z, \quad (14)$$

and the structure factor in the z direction,

$$\hat{s}_f^z(\kappa) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j,k=1}^L e^{-i\kappa(j-k)} \hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_k^z \quad (15)$$

where $\kappa = 2\pi p/L$ stands for momentum and $p = 0, 1, 2, \dots, L$ is a positive integer. These are all observables accessible to experiments in optical lattices.

For the Néel state, Eq. (13) for the three observables above give the very simple expressions,

$$S_{L/2}^{z,|\text{NS}\rangle}(t) \approx S_{L/2}^z(0) [1 - J^2 t^2],$$

$$C_{\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}+1}^{z,|\text{NS}\rangle}(t) \approx -\frac{1}{4} [1 - J^2 t^2], \quad (16)$$

$$s_f^{z,|\text{NS}\rangle}(\pi, t) \approx \frac{L}{4} - \frac{J^2 t^2}{2} \left(\frac{2}{L} - 3 + L \right). \quad (17)$$

Notice that the structure factor, which is a nonlocal observable in position, shows a dependence on L that is absent in the local observables.

The comparison between numerical results and the analytical expressions (16) and (17) for five different clean final Hamiltonians are shown in Fig. 2. The agreement at short times is very good. The results confirm that the dynamics is independent of Δ_F or λ_F , all curves falling on top of each other.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Evolution of the spin-spin correlation (left) and structure factor (right), both in the z direction, for the Néel state. The final Hamiltonians are clean, $\varepsilon = d = 0$, and have the following parameters: $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 0$ (circle), $\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 0$ (square), $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 0.4$ (triangle), $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 1$ (cross), and $\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1$ (star). Solid curves are the analytical results from Eq. (16) and (17); $L = 16$.

The saturation value of $C_{\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}+1}^z$ is closest to zero when E_{ini} is closest to the center of the spectrum. Among the final Hamiltonians considered, this happens for the strongly chaotic and anisotropic $\hat{H}_F$ ($\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1$). Scaling analysis performed in [14] suggests that in the thermodynamic limit, the saturation value goes to zero for $\hat{H}_F$ in the chaotic regime. In the integrable domain the results indicate a value different than zero and therefore possible memory retainment.

The fact that we can predict and explain the short-time behavior of a large set of observables constitutes an important first step towards the development of a general and complete picture of the relaxation process of observables in isolated many-body quantum systems.

IV. TIME FLUCTUATIONS

The system eventually relaxes to a new equilibrium, if after the transients have died, it fluctuates around a

steady state. The fluctuations need to be small and decrease with system size. Based on semiclassical arguments and full random matrices [26, 77–81], it was shown that the temporal fluctuations of observables decrease exponentially with system size. Recently, analytical studies for the bounds of the fluctuations showed that for any initial state delocalized in the energy eigenbasis of Hamiltonians without too many degeneracies of eigenvalues and energy gaps, the fluctuations scale exponentially with system size. [82–85]. In particular, the variance, σ_O^2 of the temporal fluctuations of the observables about equilibrium was shown to be given by

$$\sigma_O^2 \leq \frac{(O_{\max} - O_{\min})^2}{\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}}}, \quad (18)$$

where $O_{\max(\min)}$ is the maximum (minimum) eigenvalue of the operator $\hat{O}$.

In contrast, in the case of an integrable Hamiltonian quadratic in the canonical Fermi operators or mapped onto one, where the non-resonant conditions are not satisfied [11], it was shown analytically [86] and numerically [87–89] that the time fluctuations of one-body or quadratic observables scale as $1/\sqrt{L}$.

These findings prompted us to analyze how σ_O scales with L for integrable systems with interaction and how it depends on the energy of the initial state in realistic chaotic systems, where the states get more localized close to the edges of the spectrum. Our numerical results for spin-1/2 models show that the decay is exponential in both cases [11], in agreement with [82–85]. Systems with interactions are not highly degenerate. In the integrable domain, their energy distribution is Poisson, whereas for the integrable models mappable onto free particles, the distribution is simply a peak at zero spacing, indicating an enormous amount of degeneracies. As for the dependence on E_{ini} , the coefficient of the exponential decay becomes smaller as we move towards the border of the spectrum and IPR_{ini} decreases, but exponential fittings are still better than power-law [11].

Here, we illustrate the exponential decay of the fluctuations with L for the fidelity. Using Eqs. (5) and (6), the variance of the temporal fluctuations gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_F^2 &= \overline{|F(t) - \overline{F}|^2} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \neq \beta \\ \gamma \neq \delta}} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 |C_{\beta}^{\text{ini}}|^2 |C_{\gamma}^{\text{ini}}|^2 |C_{\delta}^{\text{ini}}|^2 e^{i(E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta} + E_{\gamma} - E_{\delta})t}. \end{aligned}$$

The exponential averages out, unless $E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta} = E_{\delta} - E_{\gamma}$. Under the condition of non-degenerate energy gaps, which does hold for the parameters of $\hat{H}_F$ considered here [11], this implies $E_{\alpha} = E_{\beta}$ and $E_{\delta} = E_{\gamma}$ or $E_{\alpha} = E_{\delta}$ and $E_{\beta} = E_{\gamma}$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_F^2 &= \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^4 \sum_{\beta} |C_{\beta}^{\text{ini}}|^4 - \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^8 \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}}^2} - \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^8. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

When the initial state is substantially delocalized and $\mathcal{D}$ is very large,

$$\left(\sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^4 \right)^2 \gg \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^8 \Rightarrow \sigma_F \sim \overline{F},$$

the dispersion of the time fluctuations coincide with the fidelity infinite time average.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Logarithmic plot of the standard deviation of the time fluctuations of the fidelity vs L for the Néel state. The final Hamiltonians are clean, $\varepsilon = d = 0$, and have the following parameters: $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 0$ (circle), $\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 0$ (square), $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 0.4$ (triangle), $\Delta_F = 1, \lambda_F = 1$ (cross), and $\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1$ (star). Solid curves are the analytical results from Eq. (19).

TABLE I: E_{ini} and IPR_{ini} for the Néel state; $\varepsilon = 0, d = 0, L = 16$.

$\hat{H}_F$	E_{ini}	IPR_{ini}
$\Delta_F = 1.0, \lambda_F = 0.0$	-3.750	72.15
$\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 0.0$	-1.875	129.83
$\Delta_F = 1.0, \lambda_F = 0.4$	-2.350	336.78
$\Delta_F = 1.0, \lambda_F = 1.0$	-0.250	1805.25
$\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1.0$	-0.125	2071.92

In Fig. 3, we show the standard deviation of the time fluctuations of the fidelity for the Néel state. Symbols are numerical results and solid lines correspond to the results from Eq. (19). Notice that the latter requires exact diagonalization, which we can perform for L up to 16. We see from the figure that for the interacting systems, in the integrable ($\lambda_F = 0$) or chaotic ($\lambda_F > 0$) domains, σ_F decays exponentially with L . The value of the coefficient of this decay increases with IPR_{ini} , and the level of delocalization of the initial state improves as λ_F increases and Δ_F decreases (cf. Fig. 3 and Table I).

For the strongly chaotic final Hamiltonians, $\Delta_F = 1.0, \lambda_F = 1.0$ and $\Delta_F = 0.5, \lambda_F = 1.0$, fittings to the curves of Fig. 3 indicate that the coefficient C in $\sigma_F \propto \exp(-CL)$ is $C \sim 0.7$. This value coincides with the decay expected for an initial state extracted from GOE full

random matrices, where $\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}} \sim \mathcal{D}/3$. In the subspace considered here, where $\mathcal{S}^z = 0$ and $\mathcal{D} = L/(L/2)!^2$, and using Stirling's approximation, we have

$$\ln \sigma_F \sim \ln(3/\mathcal{D}) = \ln 3 - L \ln 2.$$

The agreement between the values of $C \sim \ln 2 \sim 0.7$ suggests that the Néel state projected on strongly chaotic two-body-interaction Hamiltonians behaves as a chaotic state from GOE matrices.

V. THERMALIZATION

In isolated quantum systems, thermalization can happen due to dephasing. For local few-body observables, the system acts as its own environment.

The dynamics of the expectation value of an observable $\hat{O}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} O(t) &= \langle \Psi(t) | \hat{O} | \Psi(t) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 O_{\alpha\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}*} C_{\beta}^{\text{ini}} e^{i(E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta})t} O_{\alpha\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $O_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \psi_{\alpha} | \hat{O} | \psi_{\beta} \rangle$. In the absence of too many degeneracies, the off-diagonal elements of $O(t)$ oscillate very fast and cancel out on average, so the infinite time average is

$$\overline{O} = \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^2 O_{\alpha\alpha} \equiv O_{\text{DE}}. \quad (21)$$

Since this average depends only on the diagonal elements of $\hat{O}$, it is commonly referred to as the prediction from the diagonal ensemble (DE) [35].

Thermalization occurs when the infinite time average becomes very close to the thermal (microcanonical) average,

$$O_{\text{ME}} \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{E_{\text{ini}}, \delta E}} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \\ |E_{\text{ini}} - E_{\alpha}| < \delta E}} \langle \psi_{\alpha} | \hat{O} | \psi_{\alpha} \rangle, \quad (22)$$

when the system is finite, and both averages coincide in the thermodynamic limit. Above $\mathcal{N}_{E_{\text{ini}}, \delta E}$ stands for the number of energy eigenstates in the window δE .

Two situations have been discussed as the causes of the proximity of the two averages:

(1) The eigenstate expectation value of the observables, $\langle \psi_{\alpha} | \hat{O} | \psi_{\alpha} \rangle$, is a smooth function of energy. This means that the result from a single eigenstate inside the microcanonical window agrees with the microcanonical average. This approach became known as eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) [26, 27, 35–37, 90].

(2) The coefficients C_{α}^{ini} behave as random variables. This happens when the energy distribution of the initial state fills the energy shell. The fluctuations of the coefficients in Eq. (21) become uncorrelated with $\langle \psi_{\alpha} | \hat{O} | \psi_{\alpha} \rangle$ [31, 69].

Here, we compare O_{DE} and O_{ME} for two different quenches into the chaotic domain. We are particularly interested in the case where the LDOS of the initial state is not Gaussian and ETH becomes the main justification for thermalization.

A. Local and global Quenches: Comparable Effects

In Hamiltonian (1), we now fix $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and deal with the subspace that has $L/3$ up-spins, implying dimension $\mathcal{D} = L!/[(2L/3)!(L/3)!]$ and $\mathcal{S}^z = -L/6$. Our system starts in an eigenstate of the initial Hamiltonian corresponding to the integrable XXZ model with a small defect on site 1:

$$\hat{H}_I = \varepsilon J \hat{S}_1^z + \hat{H}_{\text{NN}}.$$

Two quenches are then carried out:

- A local quench, where the perturbation is localized on a single site: $d_1 = 0 \rightarrow d_F \neq 0$. The final Hamiltonian becomes a chaotic impurity model with NN couplings only,

$$\hat{H}_F^{\text{local}} = \hat{H}_I + d_F J \hat{S}_{[L/2]}^z.$$

- A global quench, where the perturbation affects simultaneously all sites in the chain: $\lambda_1 = 0 \rightarrow \lambda_F \neq 0$. The final Hamiltonian becomes the chaotic Hamiltonian with NNN couplings,

$$\hat{H}_F^{\text{global}} = \hat{H}_I + \lambda_F \hat{H}_{\text{NNN}}.$$

The notion of local and global above presupposes, of course, spatial representation [10, 91–101].

We have shown that, for the same initial states, both quenches may lead to very similar results, provided the perturbation is in the weak coupling regime [15]. In this limit, $\hat{H}_F^{\text{local}}$ and $\hat{H}_F^{\text{global}}$ written in the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_I$ have very similar structures, give equivalent signatures of chaos associated with eigenvalues and eigenstates, and lead to similar values of the expectation values of few-body observables.

To quantify the crossover from integrability to chaos, we show in Fig. 4 the level spacing indicator χ defined as [15, 38]

$$\chi \equiv \frac{\sum_i [\mathcal{P}(s_i) - \mathcal{P}_{WD}(s_i)]}{\sum_i \mathcal{P}_{WD}(s_i)}, \quad (23)$$

where the sums run over the whole spectrum, s is the spacing between neighboring levels, $\mathcal{P}(s)$ is the level spacing distribution, and $\mathcal{P}_{WD}(s) = (\pi s/2) \exp(-\pi s^2/4)$ is the Wigner-Dyson distribution. The latter is found for GOE full random matrices or any chaotic system with real and symmetric Hamiltonians. Close to the integrable domain, χ is large, since $\mathcal{P}(s)$ is far from $\mathcal{P}_{WD}(s)$, and it approaches zero in the chaotic regime.




FIG. 4: (Color online) Indicator χ of the integrable-chaos crossover vs the perturbation strength for the impurity (filled squares) and the NNN (empty circles) models; $\Delta = 0.48$. From top to bottom: $L = 12, 15, 18$.

In Fig. 4, as d_F and λ_F increase, both models become chaotic and show similar values of χ for the same system sizes. If the perturbation is further increased well above 1, the systems eventually reach another integrable point. Notice also that as L increases, not only χ decreases, but also the value of the perturbation leading to small χ . The onset of chaos in the thermodynamic limit may therefore be achieved with an infinitesimally small integrability breaking term [15, 38].

1. Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis

When $\hat{H}_F$ is chaotic, the eigenstates $|\psi_\alpha\rangle$ written in the eigenstates of $\hat{H}_I$ and away from the edges of the spectrum are very delocalized [15, 38–40]. They are similar to random vectors. Thus, their values of IPR_α become smooth functions of energy, as seen in Fig. 5 (a) and (c). This is to be contrasted with the integrable XXZ model, where large fluctuations prevail [Fig. 5 (e)].

The similar structures of the eigenstates in the chaotic domain lead to small fluctuations of $\langle\psi_\alpha|\hat{O}|\psi_\alpha\rangle$. This is illustrated in Fig. 5 (b) and (d) for the spin-spin correlation. We see that for the parameters where the structures of $\hat{H}_F^{\text{local}}$ and $\hat{H}_F^{\text{global}}$ are similar, the sizes of the fluctuations are also comparable. In contrast, for the integrable model, the fluctuations are much larger [Fig. 5 (f)]. By comparing the eigenstate expectation values of few-observables for different system sizes, we also verified that the fluctuations decrease with system size for the two chaotic systems [15, 40], but not for the integrable model. These results indicate agreement with ETH and the viability of thermalization in the chaotic domain.




FIG. 5: (Color online) Inverse participation ratio (left) and expectation values of the spin-spin correlation (right) vs E_α for all the eigenstates of the Hamiltonians with $\Delta = 0.48$ and $d_F = 0.9$ (a,b); $\lambda_F = 0.44$ (c,d); and $d_F = \lambda_F = 0$ (e,f). The basis corresponds to the eigenstates of the XXZ model with $\Delta = 0.48$ (a,c) and the eigenstates of the XX model (e). For all cases: $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $L = 18$.

2. Thermalization: Infinite Time Average = Thermal Average

After the analysis of static properties, the usual procedure is to first check if the system relaxes to a new equilibrium, and only then investigate which equilibrium it reached. The initial state is selected according to a temperature T . This is done by searching for the E_{ini} that is closest to the energy

$$E_T = \frac{\sum_\alpha E_\alpha e^{-E_\alpha/k_B T}}{\sum_\alpha e^{-E_\alpha/k_B T}}, \quad (24)$$

where k_B is Boltzmann constant and it is set to 1.

In the weak coupling limit (although non-perturbative regime), the LDOS of the initial states projected onto $\hat{H}_F^{\text{local}}$ and $\hat{H}_F^{\text{global}}$ is Lorentzian, causing an exponential decay of the fidelity for both cases [15]. The two quenches differ only if we further increase the perturbation. For the local quench, the energy distribution of the initial state is restricted to the Lorentzian shape, while for the global case, it can eventually reach the Gaussian form and lead to a faster Gaussian decay of the fidelity [13–15].

Few-body observables also decay very fast for both quenches, eventually reaching the infinite average and fluctuating around it. To quantify the proximity between this average and the thermodynamic average, we compute the relative difference,

$$\Lambda O = \frac{|O_{\text{DE}} - O_{\text{ME}}|}{|O_{\text{DE}}|}. \quad (25)$$

We verify that ΛO is small and indeed decreases with L for both quenches, suggesting thermalization. The relative difference is smaller for larger perturbation and larger temperature.




FIG. 6: (Color online) Relative difference for $C_{\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}+1}^z$ vs d_F (a) and λ_F (b) and vs temperature (c,d). Top panels: Initial state with $T = 7J^{-1}$. Bottom panels: $d_F = 0.9$ (c) and $\lambda_F = 0.44$ (d). All panels: $\Delta = 0.48$; $L = 12$ (circles); $L = 15$ (triangles); $L = 18$ (squares).

The top of Fig. 6 shows $\Lambda C_{\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}+1}^z$ for different values of the perturbations for the quenches to the impurity (a) and NNN (b) Hamiltonians. The relative differences are of similar magnitude for both models and clearly decrease with L . They also decrease with the perturbation, but appear to reach a minimum before increasing again. The latter must be related with the approach to a new integrable point, achieved when d_F and λ_F become very large (cf. Fig. 4).

In the bottom of Fig. 6, we use the values of the parameters where both quenches are similar and the energy distribution of the initial state is Lorentzian. The figure shows $\Lambda C_{\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}+1}^z$ for different values of temperature for quenches to the impurity (c) and NNN (d) Hamiltonians. In both cases, the agreement between the averages improve as the temperature increases and the energy of $|\text{ini}\rangle$ approaches the middle of the spectrum. The improvement with system size is also evident. The results reinforce the equivalence between the two models for the chosen values of d_F and λ_F . They also corroborate the dependence on temperature in the studies of thermalization [12, 44].

VI. CONCLUSION

This work overviews our recent studies of the behavior of isolated quantum systems with interactions from the moment they are taken out of equilibrium instantaneously until the time they reach a new equilibrium. We have employed one-dimensional spin-1/2 models, which are prototypes of many-body quantum systems. Only two-body interactions have been included. We summarize our results as follows.

(i) *Dynamics*: For realistic systems with two-body interactions, the probability of finding the initial state in time, the so-called fidelity, can show a Gaussian behavior until relaxation [13, 14]. This happens in the strong coupling regime, when the energy distribution of the initial state has a Gaussian shape, and it sets the minimum relaxation time for these systems: $t_R = \sqrt{\ln(\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}})}/\sigma_{\text{ini}}$.

Faster decays require more-body interactions, the extreme being the case of full random matrices, which sets the ultimate lower bound for the relaxation time of initial states with single-peaked energy distributions. For GOEs, the relaxation time is obtained from $[\mathcal{J}_1(2\sigma_{\text{ini}}t_R)]^2/(\sigma_{\text{ini}}^2 t_R^2) = 3/\mathcal{D}$. Initial states showing separate peaks in energy when projected in the eigenbasis of $\hat{H}_F$ can lead to decays faster than random matrices, but they were not discussed here.

The analysis of the evolution of few-body observables is still under progress. We have so far developed a simple picture for the observables that commute with the initial Hamiltonian. In this case, the short-time dynamics is partially controlled by the fidelity. For initial states corresponding to site-basis vectors and using the expression for the fidelity, we can derive analytical expressions for $O(t)$ that describe very well the numerical results [13, 14]. It remains to describe the evolution at longer times and for general observables.

(ii) *Fluctuations after Relaxation*: Overall the time fluctuations after relaxation decay exponentially with system size, even when the system is integrable, provided it does not have a high number of degeneracies [11]. The size of the fluctuations depends on the observables and on the level of delocalization of the initial state in the energy eigenbasis. For the fidelity, the dispersion is given by $\sigma_F = \sqrt{\text{IPR}_{\text{ini}}^{-2} - \sum_{\alpha} |C_{\alpha}^{\text{ini}}|^8}$.

(iii) *Thermalization*: The condition for reaching thermal equilibrium when the initial state is not already thermal before the quench is given by ETH. It requires that the eigenstate expectation values of few-body observables do not fluctuate much for eigenstates close in energy and that these fluctuations approach zero as the system size increases. This picture holds when the quench takes the system into the chaotic domain, since the eigenstates becomes similar to random vectors. In addition, for realistic systems with few-body interactions, the energy of the initial state cannot be too close to the edges of the spectrum of $\hat{H}_F$, where the eigenstates are more localized [12, 15, 38].

We have shown that local and global quenches in space can take the system into the chaotic domain. In both cases and in agreement with ETH, the eigenstate expectation values of few-body observables show minor fluctuations for states close in energy and, away from the edges of the spectrum, they decrease with system size [15]. The viability of thermalization is then inferred from the comparison between the infinite time averages and the micro-canonical averages. They get closer as the perturbation increases, the initial state moves toward the middle of the spectrum, and the system size increases.

In the thermodynamic limit, it has been shown that integrable systems cannot thermalize [102], provided the initial state is not right at the middle of the spectrum,

where the temperature is infinite. It remains to elucidate where the threshold is located, that is how close to the middle of the spectrum the initial state needs to be for thermal behavior to be possible in integrable systems and how close to the borders of the spectrum of a gapless chaotic system it can be for thermalization to occur.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the NSF grant No. DMR-1147430. E.J.T.H. acknowledges partial support from CONACyT, Mexico.

-
- [1] P. Cappellaro, C. Ramanathan, and D. G. Cory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250506 (1 (2007)).
 - [2] C. Ramanathan, P. Cappellaro, L. Viola, and D. Cory, New J. Phys. **13**, 103015 (2011).
 - [3] G. Kaur, A. Ajoy, and P. Cappellaro, arXiv:1306.2620.
 - [4] Y.-A. Chen, S. Nascimbène, M. Aidelsburger, M. Atala, S. Trotzky, and I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 210405 (1 (2011)).
 - [5] M. Aidelsburger, M. Atala, S. Nascimbène, S. Trotzky, Y.-A. Chen, and I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 255301 (2011).
 - [6] S. Trotzky, Y.-A. Chen, A. Flesch, I. P. McCulloch, U. Schollwöck, J. Eisert, and I. Bloch, Nature Phys. **8**, 325 (2012).
 - [7] S. Trotzky, P. Cheinet, S. Fölling, M. Feld, U. Schnorberger, A. M. Rey, A. Polkovnikov, E. A. Demler, M. D. Lukin, and I. Bloch, Science **319**, 295 (2008).
 - [8] J. Simon, W. S. Bakr, R. Ma, M. E. Tai, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, Nature (London) **472**, 307 (2011).
 - [9] D. Greif, T. Uehlinger, G. Jotzu, L. Tarruell, and T. Esslinger, Science **340**, 1307 (2013).
 - [10] T. Fukuhara, A. Kantian, M. Endres, M. Cheneau, P. Schausz, S. Hild, D. Bellem, U. Schollwöck, T. Giamarchi, C. Gross, et al., Nat. Phys. **9**, 235 (2013).
 - [11] P. R. Zangara, A. D. Dente, E. J. Torres-Herrera, H. M. Pastawski, A. Iucci, and L. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 032913 (2013).
 - [12] E. J. Torres-Herrera and L. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 042121 (2013).
 - [13] E. J. Torres-Herrera and L. F. Santos, arXiv:1310.5153.
 - [14] E. J. Torres-Herrera, M. Vyas, and L. F. Santos, arXiv:1402.3299.
 - [15] E. J. Torres-Herrera and L. F. Santos, arXiv:1402.7084.
 - [16] A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 120603 (2008).
 - [17] F. N. C. Paraan and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 061130 (2009).
 - [18] A. Gambassi and A. Silva, arXiv:1106.2671.
 - [19] K. Bhattacharyya, J. Phys. A **16**, 2993 (1983).
 - [20] P. Pfeifer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3365 (1993).
 - [21] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052109 (2003).
 - [22] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, EuroPhys. Lett. **62**, 615 (2003).
 - [23] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, J. Opt. B **6**, S807 (2004).
 - [24] P. R. Zangara, A. D. Dente, P. R. Levstein, and H. M. Pastawski, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012322 (2012).
 - [25] R. V. Jensen and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1879 (1985).
 - [26] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
 - [27] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).
 - [28] M. Horoi, V. Zelevinsky, and B. A. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 5194 (1995).
 - [29] V. Zelevinsky, B. A. Brown, N. Frazier, and M. Horoi, Phys. Rep. **276**, 85 (1996).
 - [30] V. V. Flambaum, F. M. Izrailev, and G. Casati, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 2136 (1996).
 - [31] V. V. Flambaum and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 5144 (1997).
 - [32] F. Borgonovi, I. Guarneri, F. M. Izrailev, and G. Casati, Phys. Lett. A **247**, 140 (1998).
 - [33] F. Borgonovi and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 6475 (2000).
 - [34] F. M. Izrailev, Physica Scripta **T90**, 95 (2001).
 - [35] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
 - [36] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 100403 (2009).
 - [37] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 053607 (2009).
 - [38] L. F. Santos and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 036206 (2010).
 - [39] M. Rigol and L. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 011604(R) (2010).
 - [40] L. F. Santos and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 031130 (2010).
 - [41] L. F. Santos, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 040601 (2011).
 - [42] M. Rigol and M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110601 (2012).
 - [43] K. He and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 063609 (2012).
 - [44] K. He and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 043615 (2013).
 - [45] E. P. Wigner, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report **2309**, 59 (1957).
 - [46] E. P. Wigner, in *Statistical theories of spectra: Fluctuations*, edited by C. E. Porter (Academic Press, New York, 1965).
 - [47] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
 - [48] T. Guhr, A. Mueller-Gröeling, and H. A. Weidenmüller,

- Phys. Rep. **299**, 189 (1998).
- [49] T. A. Brody, J. Flores, J. B. French, P. A. Mello, A. Pandey, and S. S. M. Wong, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 385 (1981).
 - [50] F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rep. **196**, 299 (1990).
 - [51] A. Gubin and L. F. Santos, Am. J. Phys. **80**, 246 (2012).
 - [52] A. V. Sologubenko, E. Felder, K. Giannò, H. R. Ott, A. Vietkine, and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. B **62**, R6108 (2000).
 - [53] C. Hess, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics **151**, 73 (2007).
 - [54] N. Hlubek, P. Ribeiro, R. Saint-Martin, A. Revcolevschi, G. Roth, G. Behr, B. Büchner, and C. Hess, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 020405(R) 1 (2010).
 - [55] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, Z. Phys. **47**, 631 (1928).
 - [56] T. Holstein and H. Primakoff, Phys. Rev. **58**, 1098 (1940).
 - [57] F. C. Alcaraz, M. N. Barber, M. T. Batchelor, R. J. Baxter, and G. R. W. Quispel, J. Phys. A **20**, 6397 (1987).
 - [58] H. A. Bethe, Z. Phys. **71**, 205 (1931).
 - [59] L. F. Santos, J. Phys. A **37**, 4723 (2004).
 - [60] O. S. Barisic, P. Prelovšek, A. Metavitsiadis, and X. Zotos, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 125118 (2009).
 - [61] L. F. Santos and A. Mitra, Phys. Rev. E **84**, 016206 (2011).
 - [62] K. Kudo and T. Deguchi, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 132404 (2004).
 - [63] K. Kudo and T. Deguchi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **74**, 1992 (2005).
 - [64] *Expokit*, <http://www.maths.uq.edu.au/expokit/>.
 - [65] R. B. Sidje, ACM Trans. Math. Softw. **24**, 130 (1998).
 - [66] V. V. Flambaum and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. E **61**, 2539 (2000).
 - [67] P. Jacquod, P. G. Silvestrov, and C.W.J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 055203 (2001); F. M. Cucchietti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **65**, 046209 (2002); T. Prosen, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 036208 (2002); T. Prosen and M. Žnidarič, J. Phys. A **35**, 1455 (2002); G. Benenti and G. Casati, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 066205 (2002).
 - [68] N. R. Cerruti and S. Tomsovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 054103 (2002).
 - [69] V. V. Flambaum and F. M. Izrailev, arXiv:quant-ph/0108109.
 - [70] V. V. Flambaum, Aust. J. Phys. **53**, 489 (2000).
 - [71] V. V. Flambaum and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 026124 (2001).
 - [72] V. V. Flambaum and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 036220 (2001).
 - [73] Y. S. Weinstein, J. Emerson, S. Lloyd, and D. Cory, Quant. Inf. Proc. **1**, 439 (2003).
 - [74] J. Emerson, Y. S. Weinstein, S. Lloyd, and D. G. Cory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 284102 (2002).
 - [75] F. M. Izrailev and A. Castañeda-Mendoza, Phys. Lett. A **350**, 355 (2006).
 - [76] A Gaussian expression for the fidelity was also derived via the central limit theorem [103].
 - [77] M. Feingold and A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 591 (1986).
 - [78] T. Prosen, Ann. Phys. **235**, 115 (1994).
 - [79] M. Srednicki, arXiv:cond-mat/9410046.
 - [80] M. Srednicki, J. Phys. A **29**, L75 (1996).
 - [81] M. Srednicki, J. Phys. A **32**, 1163 (1999).
 - [82] P. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 190403 (2008).
 - [83] A. J. Short, New J. Phys. **13**, 053009 (2011).
 - [84] A. J. Short and T. C. Farrelly, New J. Phys. **14**, 013063 (2012).
 - [85] P. Reimann, Phys. Scr **86**, 058512 (2012).
 - [86] L. C. Venuti and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 012106 (2013).
 - [87] A. C. Cassidy, C. W. Clark, and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 140405 (2011).
 - [88] C. Gramsch and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053615 (2012).
 - [89] K. He, L. F. Santos, T. M. Wright, and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 063637 (2013).
 - [90] V. I. Yukalov, Laser Phys. Lett. **8**, 485 (2011).
 - [91] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. **2007**, P10004 (2007).
 - [92] V. Eisler and I. Peschel, J. Stat. Mech. **2007**, P06005 (2007).
 - [93] V. Eisler, D. Karevski, T. Platini, and I. Peschel, J. Stat. Mech. **2008**, P01023 (2008).
 - [94] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Math. Phys. A **42**, 4005 (2009).
 - [95] M. Diez, N. Chancellor, S. Haas, L. C. Venuti, and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 032113 (2010).
 - [96] J.-M. Stéphan and J. Dubail, J. Stat. Mech. **2011**, P08019 (2011).
 - [97] U. Divakaran, F. Iglói, and H. Rieger, J. Stat. Mech. **2011**, P10027 (2011).
 - [98] P. Smacchia and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 037202 (2012).
 - [99] M. Nozaki, T. Numasawa, and T. Takayanagi, J. High Energ. Phys. **2013**, 1 (2013).
 - [100] C. T. Asplund and A. Bernamonti, arXiv:1311.4173.
 - [101] V. Alba and F. Heidrich-Meisner, arXiv:1402.2299.
 - [102] M. Rigol, arXiv:1401.2160.
 - [103] L. Campos Venuti and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022113 (2010).